

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, and 13-15 are now pending in the application. By this paper, claims 1, 2, 13 and 14 are amended and claims 5, 10, 12, and 16-18 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Specifically, the drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(b)(5) for including a reference character "S150" of Figure 4, not mentioned in the specification. The objection is respectfully traversed. Applicants note that step "S150" is described in paragraph [0055] of the specification, which has been amended above to include an explicit reference to "step S150." Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

The drawings also stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show S130 as described in the specification. The objection is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully note that paragraph [0062] of the specification, contrary to the Examiner's statement on page 3 of the present Office Action, does not describe S130. Rather, step S130 is described in paragraph [0053] of the specification and properly shown in Figure 4. For these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. To expedite prosecution, claims 2 and 14 have each been amended to revise the noted antecedent basis of "information received upon receipt of the request." Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is rendered moot by cancellation without prejudice or disclaimer.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,420). With respect to claim 16, the rejection is rendered moot by cancellation without prejudice or disclaimer. With respect to claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12-15, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an information offering apparatus for offering, via a communication network, information to a user of a product comprising a computer produced by combining parts selected from a plurality of parts. The apparatus comprises a question-and-answer items storage unit means for storing question-and-answer items including questions for each of the plurality of parts and answers for the

questions. The apparatus also comprises request-receiving means for receiving a request for offering information of the product from the user via the communication network. The request is generated by execution by the user of a short-cut link on a desktop screen of the computer. The short-cut link incorporates a plurality of part codes as parameters of a URL. The plurality of part codes correspond to the parts selected from the plurality of parts. Lee fails to teach or suggest the information offering apparatus recited by claim 1.

In Lee, a customer support system is described. Lee, Col. 4, lines 7-8. In Lee, a user interface 400 displays predetermined customer support items in a menu form and allows a user to select one of the customer support items. Lee, Col. 5, lines 9-13. Lee is silent, however, with respect to a request being generated by execution by the user of a short-cut link on a desktop screen of a computer, the short-cut link incorporating a plurality of part codes as parameters of a URL, and the plurality of part codes corresponding to parts selected from a plurality of parts that are combined to produce the computer, as recited by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Lee fails to teach or suggest the apparatus recited by claim 1. Claims 2-4 and 7-9 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and likewise define over Lee.

Limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 are also recited by claim 13. For at least the above reasons, claim 13 likewise defines over Lee. Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13 and likewise define over Lee.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 10, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,420) and Hidesawa et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0067477). The rejections are rendered moot by cancellation without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,420) and Meyer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,826,715). Claim 6 depends indirectly from claim 1 which defines over the prior art as discussed in detail above. For at least the above reasons, claim 6 likewise defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested..

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,420) and Sidie (U.S. Pat. No. 6,170,056). Claim 11 depends indirectly from claim 1 which defines over the prior art as discussed in detail above. For at least the above reasons, claim 11 likewise defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 29, 2009

By: /Bryant E. Wade/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/MPD/mmk

14490875.1